REMARKS

Claims 6-16 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-5 are previously cancelled. New claims 11-16 are added. Claims 6-10 are amended herein to clarify the invention, to express the invention in alternative wording, to broaden language as deemed appropriate and to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

Applicant herein traverses and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

Claims 6-10 are rejected as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention as a result of informalities stated in the Office Action. The claims are amended to remove or correct the informalities noted in the Office Action. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 6-10 and their allowance are earnestly requested.

Claims 6, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Liljengren (US 5,520,502). Applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejections. "Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference is deficient with regard to the following.

Docket No. F-9161 Ser. No. 10/588,663

Independent claim 6 is amended, and recites in pertinent part the following:

at least one articulated arm supported above said plane in which the workpieces are transported, the articulated arm being arranged and configured for transporting each of said workpieces with at least a lifting movement, a pivoting movement about an axis perpendicular to said plane and a horizontal movement parallel to said plane, each said articulated arm comprising first and second arm components connected together by an articulation:

- a longitudinal crossmember mounted above said plane and extending in the workpiece transporting direction;
- a carriage guided on the longitudinal crossmember, each said articulated arm being pivotably mounted directly on the carriage for providing the pivoting movement about said axis perpendicular to said plane;

It is respectfully submitted that the cited Liljengren et al. reference is devoid of teaching directed to such claimed structural configuration. In Liljengren et al., the part 19 being equated with the claimed articulated arm is not mounted directly to the carriage, but is rather mounted indirectly thereto through a vertically arranged carrier device 18 (see Fig. 2 and col. 3, lines 5-10) interposed therebetween. Furthermore, no mounting of an articulated arm is disclosed which provides pivoting about a pivot mounting axis which runs perpendicular to a plane in which the workpieces are transported.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6, 9 and 10 particularly describe and distinctly claim elements not disclosed in the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 6, 9 and 10 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim 8 is rejected as obvious over Liljengren et al. under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses this rejection. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

It is respectfully submitted that the Liljengren et al. reference cannot render the rejected claim obvious because the reference does not provide the teaching noted above with respect to the anticipation rejection of parent claim 6. Thus, the reference fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 8 and its allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim 7 is rejected as obvious over Liljengren et al. in view of Bacchi et al. (US 6,275,748) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses this rejection.

The secondary Bacchi et al. reference, cited for teaching relating solely to the provision of two articulated arms arranged as mirror images of each other, fails to adequately supplement the teaching lacking in the primary Liljengren reference, as noted above. Thus, the combination of prior art references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations, as properly required for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claim 7 and its allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 11-16 are added and are submitted as patentable over the cited art of record. Independent claim 11 recites subject matter directed to at least one articulated arm comprising first and second arm components connected together by an articulation, wherein a one of said first and second arm components is pivotably mounted directly to the carriage for pivotable movement about a pivot axis generally perpendicular to said plane so as to be pivotably supported above said plane along which the workpieces are transported which, among other features recited therein, is not believed disclosed in the cited art in the manner as claimed. Dependent claims 12-16 are patentable based on the subject matter recited therein in addition to the subject matter of claim 11.

11 F9161 am 01.wpd

Ser. No. 10/588,663

Docket No. F-9161

Applicant respectfully requests a two (2) month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. Please charge the fee of \$490 for the extension of time to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

The USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted, JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

C. Bruce Hamburg

Reg. No. 22,389

Attorney for Applicant

and,

Lawrence Wechsler

Reg. No. 36,049

Attorney for Applicant

Jordan and Hamburg LLP 122 East 42nd Street New York, New York 10168 (212) 986-2340